

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 8 are amended, support for which is found in the originally filed disclosure, including the drawings at least in Figs. 2 and 4. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over JP 2001-022499 (Suzuki) in view of JP 2004-157677 (Satoshi); and Claims 6, 7 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. 5,017,770 (Sigalov).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

***the receiver is separated from a surface on which the nozzles*** that form the equilateral triangular shape ***are arranged***, and  
***the gas or the liquid is jetted towards the receiver from the nozzles*** that form the equilateral triangular.  
[Emphasis added].

It is respectfully submitted the asserted combination of Satoshi and Suzuki fails to disclose or reasonably suggest the above-emphasized features of Claim 1.

Specifically, in Satoshi, each nozzle (11, 12, 13) jets the air toward the receiver 14, which is placed at the center of the nozzles ***in the same plane as the nozzles***. Suzuki describes jetting toward a receiver, which is separated from a surface of jetting nozzles.

The Office Action cites *In re Keller* in item 4, alleging the previously filed arguments merely argued against the references individually. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Satoshi and Suzuki describe contrasting arrangements of nozzles and receivers. As a result, it is unclear how one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could modify Suzuki in light of Satoshi to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, since Suzuki describes jetting from three nozzles towards the center of a circle where a receiver is located, it

is respectfully submitted the jetting is not directed towards the receiver, as required by Claim 1, when the receiver is separated from a surface of the nozzles, as required by Claim 1 and suggested by the modification relied upon in Satoshi. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the features of Claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention in view of the cited art. As a result, it is respectfully submitted Claim 1 (and any claim depending therefrom) is allowable over the combination of Satoshi and Suzuki.

Although directed to a different statutory class and varying in scope, it is respectfully submitted Claim 8 (and any claim depending therefrom) is also allowable over the combination of Satoshi and Suzuki for substantially similar reasons as noted above regarding Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.


Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted the outstanding grounds for rejection have been overcome and the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner disagree, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues. Otherwise, a timely Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

  
James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Marc A. Robinson  
Registration No. 59,276